DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 131 SO 021 467

AUTHOR Hausman, Jerome J.
TITLE Watching the Art Education Pendulum Swing.
INSTITUTION Center for Arts in Education, Chicago, IL. Urban Gateways.
PUB DATE 91
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Information Analyses (070)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Art Education; Art Teachers; Curriculum Design; *Curriculum Development; Educational History; Educational Philosophy; Elementary Secondary Education; Higher Education; Learning Strategies; Philosophy; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Central MidWestern Regional Educational Lab MO; Discipline Based Art Education; Getty Center for Education in the Arts

ABSTRACT

A literature review of material from 1965 to the present that influenced the art education field, including publications outside of art education, is identified. "The Process of Education" by Jerome Bruner (1965) is discussed initially. An analysis of how the Pennsylvania State Seminar (1965) called for art educators to make an effort to move art education to higher levels of clarity and effectiveness is examined. Two papers in particular are emphasized "Curriculum Problems in Art Education" (Manuel Barkan) and "Concepts, Issues, and Problems in the Field of Curriculum" (Elliot Eisner). Barkan's paper led to the development of the Aesthetic Education Project at the Central MidWestern Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL). Eisner developed the Kettering Curriculum, a forerunner to the structured, sequential curriculum advocated by the discipline based art education approach (DBAE). The Getty Center for Education in the Arts was created in 1982 and an outline of the 'discipline-based' approach that they adopted is presented. Other publications that have been influential include Howard Gardner's work, E. D. Hirsch's "Cultural Literacy," and "Towards Civilization" by the National Endowment for the Arts. Recent publications that receive a more detailed analysis include Jerome Bruner's "Acts of Meaning" and Elliot Eisner's "The Enlightened Eye." Art educators have long asserted that art education involves higher order cognitive skills and it is time this is recognized. (KM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334131

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
JEROME J. HAUSMAN
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Watching the Art Education Pendulum Swing

Jerome Hausman

Urban Gateways

SO 021 467

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Watching the Art Education Pendulum Swing

Jerome Hausman

Urban Gateways

We each go about our professional lives doing the best that we can. Daily we go about our business trying to use our most informed insights. Given the myriad of people and events, we struggle to place them in some kind of perspective; we strive to bring our best understandings to the fore so that knowledge and intelligence can be said to have weighed heavily in shaping our decisions and actions. As time goes on, as we develop a larger perspective, some of the people, events, or ideas that weighed heavily in our earlier thought processes sink to a richly deserved oblivion, while other ideas and memories take on greater importance and significance. The "test of time" provides another kind of perspective. The light shed by succeeding events helps clarify or focus upon aspects of our experience. There can be new found significance for elements that had been previously unnoticed or ignored.

In an all two brief fashion I want to reflect upon literature from the mid 1980's to the present that has influenced the Field of Art Education. Interestingly enough, our's is a Field in which many of our major cues and

directions can be said to have come from outside the Field. For example, John Dewey's Art as Experience can be said to have exerted an incredible force upon the teaching of art. It should even be noted that Dewey's acknowledgments include such people as Meyer Schapiro, Irwin Edman, and Albert Barnes--none of whom can be said to be "art educators". Hence, it should come as no surprise that I will make reference to many individuals from outside our Field whose ideas and writings can be said to have influenced us.

My analysis will begin in 1965 with the publication of The Process of Education by Jerome S. Bruner. The immediate stimulus for the book was a conference on new educational methods held at Woods Hole, Massachusetts in 1959 under the auspices of the National Academy of Sciences. What was then asserted is that each discipline (science, art, humanities, social sciences, etc.) can be said to have a fundamental structure. The basic concepts of these disciplines can be grasped by children at an early age--first, intuitively and later, through formal instruction. What was set in motion was a charge to have basic curricula rewritten so that teaching could address the most pervasive and powerful ideas of each discipline. This was a task that was to engage the best minds in each of the disciplines. After all, the decision as to what was to be taught could best be reached with the aid of those with a high degree of vision and competence in each of the fields.

In 1965, The Penn State Seminar in Art Education for Research and Curriculum Development was one of the events sponsored by the U.S. Office of Education. It should be noted that a year earlier the Office of Education had sponsored a Seminar on Elementary and Secondary School Education in the Visual Arts at New York University. Clearly, it is the Penn State Conference that is now being referred to by scholars in Art Education as the more influential of the two seminars.

Readers of the Preface to the Penn State Conference Report will note the observation that "art education derives its language, concepts and processes from the fields of art history, art criticism and studio practice. These areas provide the primary source of the content of Art education." Moreover, the preface goes on to state: "in terms of what is to be learned, what the learner is like, and how learning takes place, art education must face a systematic review and critique of aspects of theories of learning and instruction applicable to the teaching of art at all levels." In a word, the Field of Art Education was setting about to meet the change articulated by Bruner in the Process of Education. The Penn State Conference brought together an impressive array of art educators and professionals from outside the Field. It was a serious, systematic effort to "get our act together" and move the Field to higher levels of clarity and

effectiveness.

What was said at Penn State about the nature of learning and appropriate curriculum strategies for teaching in the visual arts? In retrospect, I feel that there was a common thread in the statements of Joshua Taylor (an art historian); Harold Rosenberg (an art critic) and Allan Kaprow (an artist). All three gave emphasis to the more dynamic, open-ended and more relative nature of artistic definitions and values. The views they offered gave greater emphasis to an ongoing process in which teachers and learners were engaged in the "stuff" of creation. What they had to say is deserving of a more detailed analysis than will be given here. Let me offer a few excerpts. Taylor: "in the first place it must be remembered that there is no such thing as the history of art. There are, rather, histories of various aspects of art; in the arts the way the knowledge is gained is a part of the knowledge itself; how we find out is an inseparable part of what we find out." Rosenberg: "criticism is confronted by a flood of new forms, new motives, experimental attitudes. To react intelligently to these, criticism must test itself and develop new forms of insight and expression (e.g. multiple perspectives, a rhetoric hospitable to the ambiguities and paradoxes of art itself); there are no grounds for assuming that any particular intellectual qualities will continue to prevail in criticism, anymore than in art itself. Forms, terms, concepts are

susceptible to an inner erosion that empties them of meaning or changes their meanings perhaps even into their opposites." And Kaprow: "What we are proposing is an approach to art education which has in mind only an awareness of the basic mystery of art and a belief (supported by ample evidence) that artistic people are best suited for revealing this to youngsters; systemization so far has invariably killed magic, and has broadcast false or dull values and senseless activities; we cannot assume that art, artists, motives, and publics will 'sit still'; things, people and their needs sit still only when our mind substitutes for them a stable concept. We then analyze the thought instead of the reality, and the though is what we want art to be, not what it sometimes is or what it may be tomorrow."

It happens all the time. We go to conferences and hear things that we already know. Yet, there is value in this! Anyone who has seriously studied the history of art is soon familiar with an incredible range of artistic forms and styles. Anyone who has thought seriously about art criticism soon realizes that the specific criteria for judgement in one era are altered by the necessities of dealing with new forms and styles. And anyone who has been engaged in the creation of art knows of the struggle with materials and ideas; they also know of the unpredictable nature imposed by materials and circumstances.

What then do we teach as teachers of art? My reading of what was said places emphasis upon the dynamics of process and judgments of quality.

There was, however, another paper presented at the seminar, "Curriculum Problems in Art Education" by Manuel Barkan. This paper is now seen as an important reference point for present day developments in Art Education (especially with reference to "discipline based approaches". It should be voted that Barkan was much taken with Bruner's Process of Education. Hence, no wonder his paper posed different perspectives (emphases, priorities) than those offered by Taylor, Rosenberg and Kaprow. He called for a more rational, cognitive emphasis. Looking to the arts he observed: "There are controls operating in competent work by artists, critics, and others engaged in art, and, to this important extent, they engage in structured inquiry which is disciplined. Hence, though there is no formal structure in the arts, they are a certain class of disciplines. To this extent, too, inquiry into art curriculum can be both structured and disciplined and so can the curriculum itself."

Barkan then moved on to four operational categories: 1) what to teach and toward what end; 2) what to teach to whom, and in what order; 3) what to teach with; and 4) how to evaluate outcomes of teaching. His paper concluded with an "essential course of action: the establishment of regional centers for art education curriculum development as

the 'only kind of course which could promise to cope with the problems indicated', the location of such centers in major universities would provide nuclei of the necessary talent along with other essential resources. The school personnel in the region would become involved to play their role. Developments could be tested and demonstrated in cooperating schools, communicated to and coordinated among regional centers, and disseminated to wider and wider concentric rings from the centers."

For those of us who know Manny Barkan, it's generally agreed that he was the kind of person who did what he said he would do; that is, he made a valiant effort to practice what he preached. In the ensuing years, Barkan's efforts led to developments linking Ohio State University and the Central Mid-western Regional Educational Laboratory (CEMREL) in what was to become the Aesthetic Education Project. Remember, all of this took place about 25 years ago. This was the realization of an idea: a well funded center that brought together the resources of artists, scholars, and educators for the purposes of curriculum development and implementation. Very substantial sums of money were poured into projects earnestly seeking to accomplish the work outlined by Barkan and others: "what to teach and toward what ends; what to teach to whom and in what order; what to teach with; and how to evaluate outcomes of teaching."

Unhappily, Manny Barkan's death brought to an end this struggle with an elusive and frustrating challenge. The Phase I Report of the Aesthetic Education Guidelines (published in 1970, shortly before Barkan's death) contains a number of conclusions aimed at guiding curriculum writers. However, at its best, the Report can be said to offer generalized concepts and processes for curriculum development. It offers not prescribed sequence for instruction. There are no recommended tests for evaluating learning outcomes. The Report contains a thesaurus for use by curriculum writers emphasizing multiple possibilities for what can go on in a classroom. The recommendation is made that curriculum writers must exercise their ingenuity to create challenging materials.

Elliot Eisner presented an important paper at the Penn State Conference: "Concepts, Issues and Problems in the Field of Curriculum." Along with Barkan, Eisner can be said to have exerted an important influence in shaping directions for American Art Education. In the years that followed, he developed a curriculum project sponsored by the Kettering Foundation. Later, Stephen Dobbs (who worked with Eisner) observed that the Kettering Curriculum contributed to the Getty DBAE approach by emphasizing "the importance of structure, a written and sequenced curriculum, appropriate support material, and the product of the student's work as much as the process." Kettering also provided a rationale

for each lesson, helping teachers to understand the experience and outcomes being sought and the contribution of each lesson to the larger art experience. The seeds for what was to become the Getty Program can be seen as having been solved as far back as 1968.

I have cited the Barkan and Eisner influences stemming from the Penn State Conference. Of course, one could cite numerous other sources that serve as background for looking at our present literature. The times were such as to encourage and support centers that engage in planning what is to be taught with agreed upon curriculum materials, and with systematic modes of measuring and evaluating learning outcomes. A period of educational reform, with emphasis upon teacher accountability, gives added weight to these approaches. The regional educational laboratories such as SWIRL or CAREL or CEMREL are examples of this phenomenon.

It was in 1982 that the Getty Center for Education in the Arts was created. The Center has adopted what it refers to as a "discipline-based" approach to art education. Their position is that education in the visual arts like other "established areas" in the curriculum" should be approached as a serious subject of study with a sequential curriculum that balances and integrates instruction in art history, criticism, studio production and aesthetic perception. " Over and over again, reference is made to the serious and

disciplined nature of studying the visual arts. Emphasis is given the necessity to have a written curriculum. Given this orientation, it follows that evaluation (and testing) of student learning is a mandated part of the program.

Doubtless, historians of art education will refer to the period 1983-1990 as one in which the Getty Center exerted substantial influence upon the Field. A detailed analysis of the Center's efforts is not possible here. Suffice to say: "The Center is committed to contributing to an evolutionary process which involves the articulation, refinement, and application of DBAE in classrooms. It initiates and supports programs in five major areas: Advocacy, Professional Development, DBAE Theory Development, Demonstration Programs, and Curriculum Development."

There has been oh so much more that can now be seen as having exerted influence on the Field. the writings of Howard Gardner have been very important. The Arts and Human Development (1973); Artful Scribbles: The Significance of Children's Drawings (1980); Art, Mind, and Brain (1982) have become "required readings" for many of our graduate students. Gardner's Frames of Mind received the 1984 National Psychology Award for Excellence in the Media. In this book he makes the case for the existence of multiple intelligences: linguistic, musical, logical mathematical, spatial, bodily--kinesthetic, and personal intelligences (information--processing capacities--one directed inward, the

other outward). These forms of intelligence interact with and build upon one another. As Gardner put it, "in normal human intercourse, one typically encounters complexes of intelligences functioning together smoothly." What is important to note is that Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences places emphasis upon the arts in education. More specifically, he has been involved in ARTS PROPEL, a collaborative project combining the resources of Harvard's Project Zero, The Educational Testing Service and the Pittsburgh Public Schools, that seeks to develop different means of assessing intellectual competencies (particularly in the arts). Over the years there has been a gradual evolution toward curriculum, so that the line between assessment and curriculum has become blurred. Project PROPEL has kept the creation of art forms as being central to instructional intent. As Howard Gardner put it: "Artistic education ought to feature artistic production--the making of art objects and the gaining of facility in thinking in particular artistic symbols systems; artistic perception--the ability to make fine and appropriate discriminations of one's own art works and in art works produced by others, including artistic masters; and artistic reflection--the capacity to step back from works of art, to think about their purposes, the extent to which and the manner in which they have been achieved, and to clarify the nature of one's own productions and

perceptions." This work is still in process and, like the efforts of the Getty Center, is being watched with interest on the part of those advocating a greater role for the arts in education.

Another of the publications that I feel has exerted great influence on our Field (and on education, in general) is E.D. Hirsh's Cultural Literacy: What Every American Needs to Know (1987). There's a very commonsensical ring to the arguments he advances: "To be culturally literate is to possess the basic information needed to thrive in the modern world. Only by accumulating shared symbols, and the shared information that the symbols represent, can we learn to communicate effectively with one another in our national community".

What's to be done? Hirsch and two of his colleagues at the University of Virginia (Joseph Kett and James Trefil) have developed a listing of 4450 terms or phrases that would serve as a minimal guide of practical use to teachers, students, and all others who need to know our literate culture. It is interesting to note that only 240 entries (about 5%) deal with the arts; 53 (or a little over 1%) deal with the visual arts. I'm confident that Hirsch could be the first to agree that his listing should be subject to some modification. It is not etched in stone. Yet, his book has served to give encouragement to those arguing for a more singular, basic curriculum. These arrangements slip into

another position: the argument that the schools are "failing" and what we now need is a more disciplined approach in which the deficiencies of American education are corrected. Frank Hodsell, then Chairman of the National Endowment for the Arts, in the report: Toward Civilization (NEA, 1988) declared that "the present state of arts education is unsatisfactory." He observed "resources are being provided, but they are not being used to give opportunities for all, or even most, students to become culturally literate. The arts are, in general, not being taught sequentially. Students of the arts are not being evaluated. Many arts teachers are not prepared to teach history and critical analysis of the arts."

Few would disagree that the arts in education are in need of greater support and change. The issue that I would raise brings into question the proposed or implied remedies for the difficulties being faced.

Just as Manny Barkan was frustrated in his effort to develop more rational, systematic, and sequential models (a structural equivalency to the sciences), I feel that present efforts along these lines will be doomed to these same frustrations. Interestingly enough some of my cues for what we ought to be paying attention to are two recently published books: Jerome Bruner's Arts of Meaning (1990) and Elliot Eisner's The Enlightened Eye (1991). Both are men whose

earlier works have exerted a strong force on Art Educators; both have continued in their study and are now offering insights born of their more recent inquiry and reflection. Bruner, for example, now observes that our "technological virtuosity have cost dear". He laments particular emphases and directions stemming from the "cognitive revolution". As he put it: "emphasis began shifting from 'meaning' to 'information', from the construction of meaning to the processing of information. Information processing cannot deal with anything beyond well-defined and arbitrary entries that can enter into specific relationships that are strictly governed by a program of elementary operations...information processing needs advance planning and precise rules."

What Bruner is now calling for is a renewal and refreshment of what he took to be the central intent of the original cognitive revolution: attention to meaning as well as the processes and transactions involved in the construction of meanings. A transposition of this idea for Art Education would call for a renewal and refreshment of what I take to be the central intent of our field: Attention to meaning in art as well as the process and transactions involved in creating or responding to art. He then goes on to make the case for "open-mindedness--whether in politics, science, literature, philosophy, or the arts." As he put it: "I take open-mindedness to be a willingness to construe knowledge and values from multiple perspectives without loss

of commitment to one's own values." All of this casts a very different light on efforts to construct singular, linear sequential curricula that can be applied district or state-wide.

And, what about the underlying ideas for defining such central concepts as "mind" and "self"? Bruner's lament is that "we in psychology preferred to rely upon standardized research paradigms to 'define' our concepts. We take these research paradigms to be the operations that define the concept we are studying--tests, experimental procedures, and the like. In time, these methods become proprietary, as it were and come rigidly to define the phenomenon in question: intelligence is what intelligence test measure."

What I enjoyed about Bruner's book and hope will become a force for those of us in Art Education is his call for a "folk psychology" orientation in which we pay attention to how people organize their views of themselves, of others and the world in which we live. As Bruner put it: "When we want to bring an account of something into the domain of negotiated meanings we say of it, ironically, that it was a good story." Roger Schank in his book "Tell Me a Story: A New look at Real and Artificial Memory" (1991) has a very simple observation: "people remember what happens to them and they tell other people what they remember. People learn from what happens to them, and they guide their future

actions accordingly."

All of which brings me to Elliot Eisner's more recent publications: Qualitative Inquiry in Education (which he edited along with Alan Peshkin, 1990) and The Enlightened Eye, Qualitative Inquiry and the Enhancement of Educational Practice (1991). Both are books that are addressed to the larger field of Education; both can be said to draw upon special sensitivities to qualities rather than quantities in our assessment of educational practice. So much more might be said of the consequences of more standardized quantitative methods in evaluation. Within the Field of Art Education, there are many who would cast a wary and suspicious eye at methodologies that would codify, standardize, isolate, and quantify elements in artistic perception, production, and reflection. Worse yet, there's a lingering fear that such methodologies will drive instruction: teachers will teach for the test even though that which is being tested has all but eviscerated the qualities of what makes something art or an artistic experience. But, the converse of this reasoning can also be the case. Assessment approaches that are sensitive and responsive to the qualitative dimensions of arts instruction can be seen as supporting (indeed, enhancing) what we are trying to do. More simply put: if teachers are to teach for the test, then what we need to do is develop testing approaches that encourage good teaching. If this is to happen we need to design and implement

methodologies more fitting for the essential values and practices in the arts themselves. As Eisner and Peshkin put it in the introduction of their book: "On projecting the potential consequences of the new conversation, we do not claim that standards or, better yet, criteria for the assessment of the value of qualitative work are less rigorous than the standards applied to research of a conventional kind. On the contrary, because there are no algorithms, no statistical significance test for qualitative studies, that most exquisite of human capacities must come into play: judgment. But good judgment is not a mindless activity. It depends upon attention to detail, sensitivity to coherence, appreciation of innuendo, and the ability to read sub-text as well as text. Essays written by the left hand need to be read with as much rigor as those written by the right." (Interestingly enough, Jerome Bruner had entitled one of his books: On Knowing: Essays for the left Hand in 1962).

"That most exquisite of human capacities must come into play: judgment." Eisner's book builds a methodology for educational imaginary and evaluation from ideas that are rooted in the arts and humanities. The terms "connois-seurship appreciation, and criticism "weigh heavily in the arguments that he shapes. What I think is important to note is that this serves as an example of how orientations and practices that are well developed in relation to the arts and

humanities can serve to inform us in relation to general educational practice. As Eisner put it: the book is based on several premises:

"1) There are multiple ways in which the world can be known. Artists, writers, and dancers, as well as scientists, have important things to tell about the world.

2) Human knowledge is a constructed form of experience and therefore a reflection of mind as well as nature: knowledge is made, not simply discovered.

3) The forms through which humans represent their conception of the world have a major influence on what they are able to say about it.

4) The effective use of any form through which the world is known and represented requires the use of intelligence.

5) The selection of a form through which the world is to be represented not only influences what we can say, it also influences what we are likely to experience.

6) Educational inquiry will be more complete and informative as we increase the range of ways we describe, interpret, and evaluate the educational world.

7) Which particular forms of representation become acceptable in the educational research community is

as much a political matter as an epistemological one. New forms of representation, when acceptable, will require new competencies."

I have come a long way, only touching lightly upon some of the "high points" in the bumpy terrain that makes up our professional field. I am ever conscious of all the points I have missed. Indeed, I am even embarrassed and apologetic about so much of the work done by colleagues in the Field of Art Education that has not even been mentioned. The picture I have sketched has moved from Jerome Bruner's Process of Education to the Penn State Conference to the CEMREL Aesthetic Education Program and the Kettering Project and from there to the Getty Center for Education in the arts and the work of Howard Gardner and ARTS PROPEL. I have made fleeting references to E.D. Hirsch's Cultural Literacy, the NEA's Report: Toward Civilization and then concluded with two more recent publications: Bruner's Acts of Meaning and Eisner's The Enlightened Eye.

Perhaps it's wishful thinking when I observe that the pendulum is beginning to swing toward greater recognition of the dimensions that make up higher order thinking. Lauren B. Resnick in the Report: Education and Learning to Think (Committee on Mathematics, Science, and Technology Education, 1987) said the following: "higher order thinking involves a cluster of elaborate mental activities requiring nuanced

judgment and analysis of complex situations according to multiple criteria. Higher order thinking is effortful and depends on self-regulation. The path of action or correct answers are not fully specified in advance. The thinker's task is to construct meaning and impose structure on situations rather than to expect to find them already apparent." We, in Art Education, have long asserted that these are the very characteristics that make up sound art instruction. It's about time that the pendulum is coming to this point.